

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following the vote on the Lute nomination, there be 10 minutes equally divided between Senators LEAHY and SPECTER, or their designees, for debate on judicial nominations; that at the conclusion or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar Nos. 85, 105, and 106, in that order; that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table; the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, Senator WARNER asked earlier today what would happen with the next judge, which is a Virginia judge. It would be my intent—I have to talk to Senator LEAHY, and I have a meeting with him this afternoon—that we do that on Monday, the day we get back. We will do the Virginia judge and the remaining district judges. So there will be four votes on the Monday we get back on the district court judges.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, if the leader will yield for a question, those three additional judges you made reference to are the three Michigan district court judges?

Mr. REID. That is right. That is what we had left on the calendar.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 2316

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 182, H.R. 2316, Lobbying Disclosure; that all after the enacting clause be stricken, and the text of S. 1, as passed by the Senate on January 18, 2007, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill be read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate with a ratio of 4 to 3, with the above occurring without intervening action or debate.

I would say to my distinguished colleague—my counterpart, Senator MCCONNELL—that it is my intent not to appoint the conferees until we get back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving right to object, and I will not object, I was not on the floor Tuesday when the majority leader first brought this issue to the Senate floor. I was down at the White House. I am pleased he is ready to go to conference on lobby reform,

the first bill introduced in this Congress, S. 1, and passed with a vote of 96 to 2 almost 6 months ago, on January 18.

I am also encouraged the Democratic House finally decided to pass a bill after many months of stalling and excuses. However, before we agree to this unanimous consent request, I would like to engage my colleague in a brief colloquy to ensure minority rights are not trampled, as they were in the supplemental.

As the Senate will recall, the majority drafted that bill and included matters not related to troop funding and not part of either bill. This was designed, obviously, to get around 41 Republican Senators here in the Senate. Obviously, putting those items in a troop funding bill made it very difficult to oppose the bill and we know how that story ended.

In that vein, I ask my good friend, the majority leader, to commit that, consistent with the provisions of S. 1—to commit not to drop extraneous provisions into this conference report not dealt with by either body. I think it is important that this very significant issue, on which we have had extraordinary bipartisan cooperation, continue to deal with the subject matter related to this bill.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I don't wish to relegislate the supplemental. I think it was one of the best things that has happened to the country in a long time. We were able to get some things in that bill, such as minimum wage, for the first time in 10 years; disaster relief for farmers, first time in 3 years; the first time we got money over and above what the President wanted for homeland security; we were able to get \$6.5 billion for Katrina.

Having said that, the distinguished Republican leader has my assurance this bill will deal with the subject matter that came out of the Senate and out of the House. It will deal with ethics and lobbying reform.

I further say to my friend, and he and I have had long discussions on this bill and I am sure we will continue to have some, this will be a real conference, as we have had for many years—not recently, but this will be a conference where there will be public debate on what we should do and what we should not do.

We will schedule that the week we get back, schedule the conference as soon as we can when we appoint conferees. There has been a request we not appoint them today. I accept that. We will do it when we get back. The minority need not worry. This legislation, when it comes back, will be perfect for the President to sign if, in fact, that is necessary. In some instances, it is not necessary. But it will deal with ethics and lobbying and nothing else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have one phone call to my cloakroom I have to deal with. I respectfully re-

quest that we have a very short quorum call, so I can consult with one of my Members. If the majority leader will not object, I would like to have a very brief quorum call.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding there is a unanimous consent pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. DEMINT. Reserving the right to object, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Madam President, earlier this year, the Senate took a major step in being more transparent with the earmarking process. We worked together. We passed within the lobbying/ethics reform bill transparency and rules that would keep us from adding secret earmarks when we go to conference. I have asked repeatedly on the Senate floor that we accept that as a rule. I had asked the majority leader to amend his unanimous consent request to go to conference to include Senate acceptance of the rules we have already passed. That way we would have the comprehensive work we have all planned to have. I understand from the majority leader they are not willing to accept that, and they want to go to conference where it is our belief it will be significantly changed.

In light of our inability to come up with agreement that would include earmark disclosure, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Again, we have delay, delay, delay, on an issue of vital importance. What we are asking is to go to conference. We have already acknowledged there will be nothing that will come out of conference other than what is in this bill. For us to do the conference out here on the Senate floor is a little unusual proceeding. All the conference committees I have been involved in have been ones where the conferees decide what should happen, and then they bring that matter back to the respective bodies. Then there is a vote on it.

If my friend from South Carolina doesn't like what comes back, he has every avenue within the rules at his disposal. No one is trying to take advantage of him. I appreciate the work he has done on earmarks. A number of other people have worked on earmarks. It has been a progressive step forward. But it would not say much about my leadership if we negotiated it out here

on the floor of the Senate as to what was going to be in the conference report. That is what the conferees are all about.

Again, we cannot go forward on the 47 different items that are in this ethics and lobbying reform—

Mr. DEMINT. Will the leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. All of which are important. Earmarking is important to my friend from South Carolina. Other Senators have other things of importance in this lobbying/ethics reform. We debated this issue. We debated it at some length. We accepted a lot of amendments. A number of amendments were not in the final draft of what went to the House. They have now completed their work. It is time we go to conference and work this out. But we are not going to piecemeal this out here on the Senate floor.

Mr. DEMINT. Will the leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I am happy to.

Mr. DEMINT. I thank the leader, and I appreciate his perseverance. I would just like to ask why the part of this bill that applies only to the Senate—it does not need to be conferred with the House because it is our rule about how we deal with earmarks, how we deal with the conference of out-of-scope earmarks. Why can't we just accept that part here and go to conference with all of these other provisions in which you know our Members are interested?

I have no objection to going to conference, but there is no reason to conference with the House on rules that apply only to the Senate.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the House, of course, has issues that affect them only. Sometimes they affect what we do. So we can't do this in a vacuum. I have a suggestion. I think it is a valid, constructive suggestion. I would say to my friend from South Carolina, what he should do is see what he can do to get on the conference. That is what I would suggest. I would be happy to have you on the conference. I don't select who the Republicans put on the conference, but that may be an answer to the problem. I would be happy to have you in the conference. I think it would be a good exercise for you to see what goes on inside of a real conference.

Separate and apart from that, I have to simply say, this is, again, a diversion, a distraction from doing the work of this country.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask the majority leader if I understand what has happened here. We have adopted the language of the Senator from South Carolina in S. 1, 96 to 2. We sent it over to the House for consideration. The Senator from South Carolina came to the floor while the House was deliberating and insisted that we move forward. We said we had to wait for House

action, and House action has taken place, moving us to a conference. Now the Senator from South Carolina is objecting to going to a conference so that this could become the law of the land and the rules applying to the Senate. Is that where we are today? The Republican Senate is objecting to going to conference on ethics and lobbying reform?

Mr. REID. The Senator from Illinois has it down pat. We have worked within the confines of the rules that have been given us. We have passed a bill. They have passed one in the House. Now is the time to see if we can make it into law.

There will be some things that will wind up being a Senate rule. Some things will wind up being a House rule. That is part of what the conference is going to work out. No one is trying to detract from anything that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina wants. But just because you want something doesn't mean you are necessarily going to get it. I just think this is such a bad way to legislate. Here we were within seconds of being able to go to conference. A phone call came in to the cloakroom. I understand that. The Republican leader has an obligation to take care of his Members. But I think this is not a good way to go.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. REID. The eyes of the American public are on us.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the majority leader, wasn't there a clear message from the last election that people wanted us to clean up the culture of corruption in this town, that they wanted ethics and lobbying reform? Isn't that why the Democratic majority picked it as S. 1, the first piece of legislation we considered, made it a high priority, and passed it with a strong bipartisan vote? And isn't it a fact that because of the objection from the Republican side of the aisle, we now run the risk of having nothing, no change, no reform in lobbying or ethics, and that the Senator from South Carolina has asked for you to guarantee a result from a conference committee?

Mr. REID. I appreciate—

Mr. DEMINT. Madam President, may I respond?

Mr. REID. For the first time in 131 years, someone was indicted working in the White House. That man has now been convicted and is in prison. The President's appointee to handle Government contracting was led away in handcuffs from his office. He is now in prison. The majority leader of the House of Representatives was convicted three times of ethics violations. He has now resigned in disgrace after having been indicted in Texas.

We have another Congressman, part of the whole Abramoff scandal, who is in prison. Many staff members have

pled guilty to crimes, have quit. Some of them are giving State's evidence. The investigations are still ongoing. A couple of days ago, Mr. Griles, second in command at the Interior Department, was sentenced to prison.

It is time that we got real and change this culture. That is what this legislation is all about. It is time that we started doing things for the American people. One of the things we can do is tell the American people that we are distancing ourselves from this culture of corruption.

That is what this legislation is all about. To not allow us to go to conference on some petty issue that my friend has raised is really bad, not good for the American people. This is a bill loaded with good things. We want to do some good things for the American people.

On some procedural suggestion that is not within the confines of common sense and good judgment, we have an objection. That is wrong. All it does is focus more attention on the culture of corruption.

Mr. DEMINT. Will the Senator allow a response?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. I thank the Chair.

I am very surprised to hear earmark reform referred to as a trivial issue. More than anything else, the things that you were just talking about, the corruption, are all earmark related, where Congressmen have sold earmarks for bribes. A big part of the corruption here is earmarks. To respond in a more detailed way, the House has passed its own rules package. It didn't relate to us. They did not send it to conference. They didn't need the Senate to advise. They adopted their own rules. We know, if I could speak through the Chair to Senator DURBIN, that if we send this to conference, nothing will be done this year. This conference will work for months. We will not have earmark reform during this year's appropriations process. That is exactly what this is intended to do.

For that reason, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, again, that the rules be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 123 and S. Res. 260; that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I would assure my friend that I have spoken to the Speaker on more than one occasion. We have been trying to get to conference on this for quite some time now. They completed their work. It has been about 3½ weeks. I believe without any stretch of the imagination, we will finish this conference in a week. It might go 10 days. But it will only be a question of scheduling. The conference will go very quickly. It will be a public conference.

I would say to my friend—I say this respectfully—did you serve in the House before you came here?

Mr. DEMINT. Yes, sir.

Mr. REID. I thought so. So you are probably not familiar with conferences because under Republican leadership, they were eliminated. There were no conferences. I have said we will hold public conferences. So even though my friend is probably not familiar with a real conference, we will have one. It will not take all year. It will not take all conference. We will finish it very quickly.

No one suggests that earmarking is trivial. I suggested that your objection to this is trivial. I say that you shouldn't do this. It is wrong. It is only slowing up what you in your heart want. All you are doing is slowing it up. There is no intent on my behalf to eliminate earmark reform. I think most everybody in this body lives by earmark reform. I think it would be very good that rather than some vacuous thing talking about earmarks, we have something here that we can look to that is either a part of a law or a rule. My friend should not worry about this taking a long time. Once we get to conference, it will not take long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I would like to address my comments to my friend from South Carolina. The bottom line is very simple. We have conference committees to move things along, not to slow them down. My colleague from South Carolina has concerns about earmarks. I understand them. They are heartfelt. But it is clear that if we acceded to his request, any single Senator, because of any issue on any bill, could hold up progress completely—on ethics reform, on 9/11, on anything else.

I will tell you my reading. I am from a different part of the country than my colleague, but people want us to get some things done. They don't want us to say: If I don't get it exactly my way on my provision, I am going to hold everything up. That is the consequence of what my friend from South Carolina is saying.

Mr. DEMINT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I might feel that the worst part of what happened, the scandals we talked about, is the free trips. I might say: I don't want to trust anything to conference reports. Unless free trips are done exactly as we say here, I want to hold up the bill. One of my colleagues might say that they think the worst thing is flying and the airplanes.

Mr. DEMINT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I will in a minute. We would be totally gridlocked. If each of us in this body of 100, each with strong opinions and great talents, were to say: I am not going to let anything move forward unless I get my thing done, period, without change, without discussion, without modification, with the other body, we would be where the public doesn't want us: gridlocked on ethics reform, gridlocked on 9/11, gridlocked on everything else.

I am happy to yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. I thank the Senator for the comment. You are exactly right. If this was just what I wanted, I would not hold up anything. This is something you voted for. Every Senator voted for this earmark reform as a Senate rule, not as something we are going to debate with the House but as our rule. All I am asking is that we adopt the rules for the Senate that we have already passed. I do not want to hold up this conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have a vote scheduled. I have just received word from the Appropriations Committee, bipartisan, they need another 10 minutes. So I ask unanimous consent that they have 10 minutes; otherwise, I will just go into a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. So the vote will take place at 10 after the hour.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, reclaiming my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I understand this passed by a whole lot of votes. That is not the point. There are lots of things that pass by a lot of votes, and then they all have to be worked out in conference committees and in other ways. If each of us insists "it is my way or I hold things up"—maybe there are ways to improve and strengthen the provisions we pass; maybe there are things other people might add; maybe there will be the kinds of legislative tradeoffs that will make a stronger ethics bill. We all have no way of knowing. But we do know one thing: If what the Senator from South Carolina is doing, by asserting his prerogatives in the Senate, was done by everybody, or even five other Senators, we would absolutely have no ethics reform—no ethics reform—no ethics reform.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I come from the House of Representatives, as my friend from New York and my friend from South Carolina. Over there, in that body, the Speaker decides how everything is going to go, whether the Speaker is a Republican or Democrat. Then some people come over here from the House, and they decide they are going to use the rules of the Senate to call attention to what they think is the issue of the day.

I want to thank my friend. My question to my friend is this: If you went out and asked the average person on the street what they think about the Congress and whether we need ethics reform and if we should pass ethics reform, my friend, I think, would agree—and I will ask him this—they would answer, yes.

Then, if you followed it up, I say to my friend, and said: Well, there are one

or two things missing from this bill; we took care of 12 things, but it is tough because we have to work across party aisles. It is tough because everybody has his or her own idea. Do you think it is good to get started with the package we have and get it done for the American people?

What does my friend think the average person would say?

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the average person would say—because the average American is practical—anyone who insists on only his way or her way is gumming up the works. To get 90 percent or 95 percent of what is a good package, most people would say, yes.

I will say another thing to my colleague.

Mr. DEMINT. Madam President, will my Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I will be happy to yield when I finish my little colloquy with my friend from California.

My guess is, if you ask the person on the street what is the most egregious abuse in terms of lobbyists and ethics, it is the trips. That is what caught the highlights. It was all the free gifts and all the emoluments and going to London and going here and going there. Most people, if you asked them about earmarks, and they knew what the earmarks were—they would say the bridge from Alaska is a bad thing, and there are a few others that are a bad thing—but my guess is that 95 percent of the people in this body—maybe 100 percent; maybe my friend from South Carolina is proud of the earmarks they have put in and they should be made public early and there should be debate on them—but they, in themselves, are not wrong as the free trips, in themselves, are wrong.

So the bottom line is, if you ask the average citizen, my colleague from California is right, they would say: Move forward because there is a lot in this bill that is important. In fact, the No. 1 abuse we read about might have been trips or emoluments or something like that more than earmarks.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I am happy to yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, is the Senator aware that the bill just objected to by the Republican Senator from South Carolina that we want to take to conference to make into law includes provisions that toughen the rules concerning gifts and travel, banning gifts from registered lobbyists, requiring the market value be paid for tickets to events, prohibiting Senators from participating in events to honor them at a national convention, extending the ban on travel paid for by lobbyists, requiring Senators and staff to receive approval from the Ethics Committee before accepting expenses for any trip paid for by private sources, requiring full disclosure of any travel on

noncommercial airlines, requiring certifications and disclosures filed by Senators and staff available to the public for inspection?

Also, it includes slowing down the revolving door between Senators and staff, so those leaving the Senate are limited in the jobs they can take; reducing and eliminating negotiations for another job by a sitting Senator in terms of where they might go when they leave the Senate; also, prohibiting staff contact with lobbyists who are family members of the Senator; also, voting to significantly expand lobbying disclosure.

It goes on for lengthy paragraphs: voting to prohibit partisan efforts like the K Street Project, that notorious project involving lobbyists and Members of the Senate; voting to deny pensions to former Members convicted of certain crimes; voting to protect the integrity of conference reports.

Does the Senator from New York not make this point, that when one Senator stands up and says: Well, I have one little section that I want to guarantee is going to be in the final conference report, that Senator is stopping us from considering all of these elements of ethics and lobbying reform, each of which points to some concern of Members of the Senate where we want to change the ethics standards, clean up the culture of corruption?

So when the Republican Senator from South Carolina objects to going to conference, he stops us from considering any and all of the things I just read.

Is that the point the Senator from New York is making?

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Illinois. That is exactly the point I am making. I would say, the reason we have a Senate, and not a body of one, is because there are different views. Some of the things that my colleague from Illinois read to me are the most objectionable that are on the books now.

I would guess the public is probably closer to my view than the view of the Senator from South Carolina. I would guess what bothered them the most with Abramoff, or with anything else, was all the trips and emoluments and the way the lobbyists sort of insinuated their way into the whole process. There are hundreds of earmarks where there were no lobbyists involved. There were many more earmarks—most earmarks—where the public debate would be supported by this body.

Mr. DEMINT. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. So I would say to my friend from Illinois that is exactly the point. If each of us insists that our little provision must be passed on its own—no debate, no discussion, no moving forward with the general process—we would have no ethics reform.

Mr. DEMINT. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. So despite the good intentions of my colleague from South

Carolina, the effect of what he is doing is preventing good, strong, tough ethics reform across the board on issues such as earmarks, but also on issues such as trips and the K Street Project, and everything else from moving forward.

So my colleague from Illinois makes a point that I think is—

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I continue to yield to my colleague.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to ask my colleague from New York, as to the notorious K Street Project, where lobbyists had regular meetings with Members of the Senate to discuss which legislation would come up, which amendments would be considered, which provisions in the Tax Code would be passed, and which would fail—all of these things are now prohibited under the bill that we want to send to conference. They do not relate directly to earmarks, which are appropriations measures, but everyone across America would concede there were clear abuses when it came to this K Street Project.

So when the Republican Senator from South Carolina objects to taking this bill to conference, he has gone beyond earmarks. He is not allowing us to consider the broader question about what we consider to be unethical and illegal contacts between lobbyists and Members of the Senate. He is stopping us from passing new laws to bring some ethics reform to the Senate.

I ask the Senator from New York, the issue of earmarks was voted on with an overwhelming vote in the Senate. The Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, is moving forward with real earmarks reform. So it would seem that the Senator from South Carolina is carping on a trifle here. We have a huge number of important legislative items to consider in S. 1.

I ask the Senator from New York, in the time he has served in the House and the Senate, can he recall a time when a Senator or Member of Congress could receive a guarantee that a conference committee was going to produce exact language as each Member would like going into the conference?

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, Madam President, I have served in this body now for 8 years. I had served in the House for 18 years. I cannot recall a single instance. We do have senses of the Senate; we had senses of the House, which are supposed to direct things. But we have never asked for a guarantee. I, for one, cannot recall someone saying: I am holding up everything until I get my guarantee. That is wrong.

Mr. DEMINT. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I will be happy to yield in a second.

I will tell you, I go to my State. It is a diverse State of 19 million people. It is not South Carolina. It is not Illinois. It is not Nevada. It is not California. It

is not Washington State. But I will tell you, the No. 1 thing I hear is: Can't you folks each give in a little bit? Can't you folks each work with one another and get something done?

That is what I hear. Yet the path my friend from South Carolina is taking is exactly the opposite because we will get good earmark reform.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL DOUGLAS E. LUTE, TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL, U.S. ARMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate resumes executive session and will proceed to a vote on Executive Calendar No. 165, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Douglas E. Lute to be Lieutenant General.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lt. Gen. Douglas E. Lute, to be Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, under title 10, U.S.C., section 601?

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mrs. BOXER (when her name was called). Present.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHN-SON) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 236 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Akaka	Domenici	McConnell
Alexander	Dorgan	Menendez
Allard	Durbin	Mikulski
Barrasso	Ensign	Murkowski
Baucus	Enzi	Murray
Bayh	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Graham	Obama
Bingaman	Grassley	Pryor
Bond	Gregg	Reed
Brown	Hagel	Reid
Brownback	Harkin	Roberts
Bunning	Hatch	Rockefeller
Burr	Hutchison	Salazar
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sanders
Cardin	Inouye	Schumer
Carper	Isakson	Sessions
Casey	Kennedy	Shelby
Chambliss	Kerry	Smith
Clinton	Klobuchar	Snowe
Coburn	Kohl	Specter
Cochran	Kyl	Stabenow
Coleman	Landrieu	Stevens
Collins	Lautenberg	Leahy
Conrad	Leahy	Sununu
Corker	Levin	Thune
Cornyn	Lieberman	Vitter
Craig	Lincoln	Voinovich
Crapo	Lott	Warner
DeMint	Lugar	Whitehouse
Dodd	Martinez	Wyden
Dole	McCain	